



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/377,629	08/19/1999	BRYCE ALLEN CURTIS	AT9-99-179	8139

24033 7590 01/15/2004

KONRAD RAYNES VICTOR & MANN, LLP
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE
SUITE 210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

KISS, ERIC B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2122

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/377,629

Applicant(s)

CURTIS ET AL.

Examiner

Eric B. Kiss

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-19 and 21-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-19 and 21-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 February 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2122

DETAILED ACTION

1. The reply filed October 17, 2003, has been received and entered. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, and 21-27 are pending.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment to the specification appropriately addresses the objection to the specification based on informalities as detailed in the previous office action. Accordingly, this objection is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

3. Applicant's amendments to the specification do not completely address the objection to the specification based on the use of trademarks. Accordingly, this objection is maintained. However, the Examiner has provided some guidance below to assist Applicant in overcoming this objection.

Specification

4. The Examiner acknowledges Applicant's respectful treatment of various trademarks throughout the specification but notes that some unintended misuse of trademarks can be found in various places within the specification.

The Examiner suggests the following guidelines for appropriate use of trademarks in the specification. Applicant is advised to carefully review all occurrences of trademarks in the specification and revise such occurrences accordingly.

- a) Trademarks should not be used in plural or possessive forms.
- b) Trademarks should be capitalized (each letter) or set apart from the surrounding text by using an appropriate designation (for example INTEL... or Intel@...).
- c) Trademarks should be used as an adjective modifying a noun, wherein the noun constitutes generic terminology for the mark (for example, Windows NT® operating system).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed October 17, 2003, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 10-13, 15, 19-22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Petrusha*, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's arguments in the last paragraph of page 16, the Examiner asserts that *Petrusha* does disclose retrieving a variable into a buffer and storing the retrieved variable from the buffer into a data object. For example, in "Example 2-3" on pages 65-66, *Petrusha* discloses the use of a buffer for processing registry data and populating the tree data structure of the registry editor (see p. 66, lines 11-25). Further, the .REG file referred to in Applicant's arguments does not represent the format of the registry. The registry is a binary

Art Unit: 2122

database, where the .REG file is a specially formatted ASCII text file produced by exporting registry data so that data can be read/processed/backed-up outside the registry editor environment. Accordingly, the Examiner further asserts that *Petrusha* does not "teach away" from storing variables in data objects as Applicant has inferred, but instead, as stated above discloses such a feature.

In response to Applicant's arguments in the first paragraph of page 17, the Examiner maintains that *Petrusha* discloses that upon opening, the Registry Editor has no knowledge of the registry aside from what is made available through the Win32 API, and the Registry Editor must initialize the window view by reading information about the top-level keys in the registry (see p. 63, last paragraph, continuing onto p. 64). Once the view is initialized, the user may expand the top-level keys by clicking on the expansion button (a plus sign next to the top-level key). When the user chooses to expand a registry key, the corresponding subkeys to be displayed may or may not be already loaded into the tree structure. If the subkeys are already loaded (enumerated), they are returned by the data structure (displayed), otherwise, they are loaded into the data structure and displayed (if the selected key's subkey information has not yet been gathered by the program, the subkeys are retrieved, enumerated and added as nodes in the TreeView control; see the first paragraph on page 68). Further, as supported above, a buffer is used during the process of populating the tree data structure.

6. In response to Applicant's arguments that each reference individually "teaches away" from Applicant's claimed invention, the Examiner respectfully points out that Applicant has not cited any portions of the applied references that teach any express reasoning against, or

Art Unit: 2122

undesirable results of, employing Applicant's claimed features, and therefore, this basis of argument is not persuasive.

7. Applicant's arguments filed October 17, 2003, with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 16, 17, 19, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *DeGroof*, have been fully considered and are persuasive, with the specific exception of Applicant's argument that *DeGroof* teaches away from Applicant's claimed subject matter. As discussed above (see item 6), this argument is not persuasive.

Accordingly, this rejection is withdrawn in view of the persuasive portion of Applicant's arguments, namely the last paragraph of page 17, excluding the last sentence of that paragraph.

8. Applicant's arguments filed October 17, 2003, with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 5, 10, 14, 19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Locke*, have been fully considered and are persuasive, with the specific exceptions noted as follows:

Applicant's argument that *Locke* teaches away from Applicant's claimed subject matter, as discussed above (see item 6), is not persuasive.

Further, in response to Applicant's argument on page 18, in paragraph 3, the Examiner asserts that *Locke* discloses storing the variable from the buffer into a data object and executing a command from an application program to retrieve the variable from the data object for return to the application program (see, for example, the answer to the question "How do I provide a character buffer for a DLL function that returns a string by reference (for example, `GetEnvironmentVariable`)?", beginning on the last line of the first page, and continuing on page

Art Unit: 2122

2; in particular, it is disclosed that a StringBuffer is used to retrieve the value of an environment variable, and the value of the StringBuffer is returned as a string (a data object). See also Figure 2 for additional detail on the implementation of the StringBuffer and resulting string.

Accordingly, this rejection is withdrawn in view of the persuasive portion of Applicant's arguments, namely the argument presented on page 18, in the fourth paragraph, excluding the last sentence of that paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

10. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, 15-17, 19-22, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ron Petrusha, "Inside the Windows 95 Registry," 1996, O'Reilly & Associates, Inc. (hereinafter *Petrusha*).

As per claims 1, 10, and 19, *Petrusha* discloses executing a command from an application program (registry editor) to store at least one variable maintained by the operating system in a data object accessible to the application program, wherein the application program is executing on the operating system; determining and executing an operating system command in response to the command from the application program to retrieve the requested at least one variable; storing the retrieved at least one variable in the data object (the registry editor interacts with the operating system's registry to retrieve registry entry data through the WIN32 Registry

Art Unit: 2122

API; see, for example, the last paragraph on page 35; the section titled "Browsing the Registry with RegEdit" on pages 38-41; and the section titled "The Registry Editor and the Registry" on pages 61-68); and executing the command from the application program to retrieve the at least one variable from the data object for return to the application program (displaying the tree structure). *Petrusha* further discloses receiving a request from the application program for at least one variable maintained by the operating system (the user may attempt to expand a key within the GUI environment of the registry editor); and determining whether the requested variable is in the data object, wherein the command from the application program is processed to retrieve and store the at least one variable in the data object if the requested at least one variable is not in the data object (if the selected key's subkey information has not yet been gathered by the program, the subkeys are retrieved, enumerated and added as nodes in the TreeView control; see the first paragraph on page 68).

As per claims 3, 12, and 21, *Petrusha* further discloses receiving a request from a second application program for at least one variable maintained by the operating system (MICROSOFT Remote Registry Services Client); and returning the requested at least one variable from the data object populated as a result of the command executed by the first application program (MICROSOFT Remote Registry Services Server; the Server program interacts with the remote computer's registry via the WIN32 Registry API on behalf of the Client program, and registry entries obtained by the Server program are transmitted to the Client and displayed within the Client-side Registry Editor interface; see, for example, the section titled "Accessing the Registry on Remote Computers" on pages 60-61).

As per claims 4, 13, and 22, *Petrusha* further discloses the requested at least one variable retrieved as a result of execution of the command from the application program being a set of environment variables (registry entries are environment variables).

As per claims 6, 15, and 24, *Petrusha* further discloses the command from the application program and the operating system command being executed in a first process and the application program being executed in a second process (the registry editor application and the WIN32 Registry API are inherently separate processes).

As per claims 7, 16, and 25, in addition to the disclosure applied above, *Petrusha* further discloses the command from the application program being for storing multiple variables (see, for example, the code of example 2-4 on pages 67-68, and in particular, the last 13 lines of page 67 through the end of the code on page 68, which detail the expansion of a node including retrieving all of the child nodes); retrieving the requested variables comprising generating a data stream including the variables, comprising reading the variables from the data stream into a buffer (see, for example, the same code section discussed above, wherein the node names are read into buffers prior to executing the commands to generating the corresponding data structure information); and processing each line in the buffer to determine each variable name and value; wherein each determined variable name and value is stored in the data object (the node information is used to generate additional entries into the tree data structure through the `TreeView1.Nodes.Add` method).

As per claims, 8, 17, and 26, in addition to the disclosure applied above, *Petrusha* further discloses determining each variable name and value comprising: determining a location of an equal sign; setting the variable name to the string preceding the equal sign; and setting the

Art Unit: 2122

variable value to the string following the equal sign (this is inherently performed; as is illustrated on page 43, in the sample .REG file, the value entries for particular keys are stored in a “variable=value” format, where “variable” and “value” are both strings; by parsing the lines of the file and populating the registry tree data structure, the equal sign is inherently being recognized by the parser).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 5, 9, 14, 18, 23, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Petrusha* as applied above to claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 19, and 26.

As per claims 5, 14, and 23, in addition to the disclosure applied above, *Petrusha* further discloses the Win32 API as being a wrapper for the actual operating system functions that implement registry access. *Petrusha* further discloses methods for accessing the registry API regardless of platform (see, for example, page 96; and the discussion of various platforms in chapter 5, pages 183-206). *Petrusha* further discloses determining a type of the operating system (see, for example, page 186, last paragraph, through the two code examples on page 187; and

Art Unit: 2122

pages 521-529) with the expressed motivation of knowing which platform (Windows 3.1, Windows 95, and Windows NT) a registry-enabled application is running on in order to allow for compensation for differences in the registry APIs and the registries themselves. Although *Petrusha* fails to expressly disclose selecting the operating system native command from a set of native operating system commands for different types of operating systems, wherein the selected operating system command is capable of being executed on the operating system to retrieve the requested at least one variable, and wherein the application program is capable of executing on each of the different types of operating systems, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that because of the amount of backward compatibility built into various Microsoft® Windows® platforms, it has been well known to have applications capable of running on multiple platforms. Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to include the selection of appropriate operating system commands to access environment variables (such as registry data) on these various platforms in view of the disclosure of *Petrusha*. One would be motivated to do so to allow a registry-enabled application properly compensate for known differences in the registry APIs and the registries themselves for platforms on which the application may be run.

As per claims 9, 18, and 27, in addition to the disclosure applied above, Official Notice is taken that it has been known to employ line wrapping in text files when a line exceeds a predetermined length. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of *Petrusha*, for example, when processing a .REG file to import data into the system registry and update the tree data structure, to append the contents of a line onto a parsed value from a previous line to compensate

Art Unit: 2122

for line wrapping that may have occurred. One would be motivated to do so to ensure that elements are parsed in their entirety.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Eric B. Kiss whose telephone number is (703) 305-7737. The


Art Unit: 2122

Examiner can normally be reached on Tue. - Fri., 7:30 am - 5:00 pm. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam, can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

EBK
January 7, 2004



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER